SOCIAL SCIENCES
DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY APR 5 1958

NATIONAL REVIEW

25 Cents
April 12, 1958

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

The Soviet Price System

ROBERT V. JONES

The New York Times Debates an Issue

AN EDITORIAL

The Evolution of a Conservative

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

Articles and Reviews by . . . . . STANLEY PARRY
WILLMOORE KENDALL · EDWARD CASE · WARREN EYSTER
MORRIE RYSKIND · RUSSELL KIRK · ANTHONY LEJEUNE

For the Record

The vast efficiency of the "purge with a smile" which Khrushchev has been conducting within the Supreme Soviet has been demonstrated by the American Committee for Liberation. Of the 1,347 delegates to the Supreme Soviet in 1954, only 502 were "re-elected" in 1956 and 1958. Roughly two-thirds of the deputies are newcomers.

Rumor has it that President Eisenhower recently lost his temper with Vice President Nixon during a Cabinet meeting because Mr. Nixon's proposals for tax-reduction had prompted questions to the President at his press conference which he could not answer. Observers wonder whether this is a sign of growing friction between the two. . . . Veteran lawmakers in Washington think the Congress will adjourn as early as possible this year, leaving the White House to absorb the voters' wrath over the recession. However, Congress is first expected to drop the excise tax on everything but liquor and cigarettes—a move which the Administration will only pretend to oppose.

The government-owned BBC has banned all radio and TV jokes about summit talks with the Soviets. . . . The British are reportedly going all-out in expanding their Red China trade. British trade missions say privately they expect the U.S. to drop its absolute ban against trade with Red China soon, and they want their machinery installed in Red factories before the Americans enter the competition. . . . U.S. diplomats in the Far East want a "good offices" team out there, as well as in North Africa. The stalemate between Japan and Formosa over the boycott of Japanese goods remains unbroken. The winner to date: Red China.

Both political parties are blue over dried-up sources for campaign funds. This is said to be the toughest fund-raising year in a long time. . . . In New Jersey, Candidate Bernard Shanley has spent more on billboards alone than has Robert Morris on his entire campaign. Judge Morris is in crucial need of financial support.

Many Masons are astonished at the choice by the Supreme Grand Commander of Willard Givens as educational director. Givens, a chief wheelhorse of the National Education Association, is generally credited as an important source of left-wing influence within the NEA during the past twenty years.

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR: Wm. F. Buckley Jr.

PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher

EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell — James Burnham
John Chamberlain — Whittaker Chambers
Willmoore Kendall — Suzanne La Follette
Frank S. Meyer

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

ASSOCIATES

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

Maureen L. Buckley — Priscilla L. Buckley
Jonathan Mitchell — Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, J. B. Matthews, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Richard M. Weaver, Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, Garry Wills

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

London: Anthony Lejeune — *Madrid*: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLISHER: J. P. McFadden

CONTENTS APRIL 12, 1958 VOL. V, NO. 15

THE WEEK 339

ARTICLES

The Soviet Price System .....Robert V. Jones 345
The Evolution of a Conservative
William Henry Chamberlin 349

DEPARTMENTS

For the Record 338
The Liberal Line .....Willmoore Kendall 348
Letter from the Continent
E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn 351
Letter from London .....Anthony Lejeune 352
From the Academy .....Russell Kirk 353
To the Editor 358

BOOKS, ARTS, MANNERS

Pitfalls of the Practical .....Stanley Parry 354
Anatomy of Courage .....Warren Eyster 355
Why Olivier? .....Edward Case 356
Books in Brief 357

VERSE

Mercy Is Its Own Reward .....Morrie Ryskind 341

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except the second and third weeks in August, by National Weekly, Inc.

Copyrighted 1958 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc.

Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37th St.
New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES: Twenty-five cents a copy, $8.00 a year, $15.00 for two years. Foreign, $10.00 a year; Canada, $9.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

● In his message vetoing the Farm Bill, which would have maintained price supports at last year's level, President Eisenhower charged that by piling up "more farm products in government warehouses," and restricting "the growth of markets," the bill would "postpone the day when agriculture can be released from the strait jacket of controls." Getting behind Secretary Benson's alternate program—which would give him the authority to drop farm supports to 60 per cent of parity—the President argued that "farmers must be able to make their own management decisions on their own farms," that they "stand to profit from less rather than more governmental intervention." For Ike's a jolly good fellow. For Ike's a jolly good fel-low. For Ike's a jolly good fel-*low*. As nobody will de-ny.

● We quote from a special interview by Scripps-Howard Staff Writer James G. Lucas with President Syngman Rhee in Seoul, March 31. Astonishingly, the interview has not been widely publicized. "Timidity," said Mr. Rhee, "does not become strong men or strong nations. Who'll help you when you are attacked and all your friends have disappeared one by one? I'm amazed the United States and other free nations haven't already helped the Indonesian rebels who are desperately trying to save their nation and government from the Communists. Are not the Communists and we fighting for survival of one or the other?"

Whereupon Mr. Rhee made his announcement: the army, navy and air force of South Korea are at the disposal of the Indonesian freedom fighters.

● The case for continued economic aid to Tito, as presented to a congressional committee by "foreign aid officials": 1) Yugoslavia wields strong influence in East Europe, and therefore should be helped. 2) Yugoslavia from now on is going to pay for any military assistance it receives, and therefore should be helped. 3) Yugoslavia is the "first European country [sic] to declare its independence [sic] of the USSR," and therefore should be helped. 4) The Yugoslavs constantly "reaffirm to us . . . their desire . . . to avoid close identification with the Soviet bloc," and therefore should be helped. The officials in question all kept straight faces as they testified, and therefore should be fired.

● The Supreme Court's decision of last week upholding the contempt sentences against Communists Green and Winston is especially interesting in two respects. For one, it lined Justice Whittaker up with the abused anti-Communist minority, putting the Four Horsemen of anti-anti-Communism (Warren, Black, Douglas, Brennan) in the minority. For another, Justice Frankfurter, in a concurring opinion, flayed his colleagues in the minority for frivolous interference with established judicial practice. Justice Frankfurter may yet head the conservative counter-revolution in the Court!

● Addressing the Interparliamentary Union in Geneva, Switzerland's Foreign Minister Max Petitpierre said: "Europe is divided ideologically and politically. And here Switzerland no longer is in the middle between East and West, but she belongs to Western Europe . . . because of her democratic institutions, her cultural ties and her economic and social attitude." May we congratulate Mr. Petitpierre for reminding the world of the vital distinction between neutrality—which necessity or prudence may impose upon a nation—and neutralism—the refusal of a nation to make a moral choice between conflicting political philosophies.

● The Canadians, who are the arm and numerical backbone of the United Nations Emergency Force on the Israeli-Egyptian border, claim it has been totally incapacitated by the inefficiency of the UN headquarters in New York. And they offer plenty of evidence, *e.g.*: nearly a hundred trucks, jeeps and scout cars are out of action because of erratic delivery of spare parts; a signal corps request for four walky-talky radios ($300 each) brought in their stead four radio trucks ($20,000 each); an ordnance unit application for 250 "rat-tail springs" for servicing rolling stock was answered many months later with 250 rat traps. "I thank Heaven it was the American Army, and not UN headquarters, that ran the campaign in Korea," one recently returned officer said, "otherwise we would have been pushed into the sea in a few weeks." Who says the UN isn't building good will for the United States!

● One by one every last harebrained scheme of the nineteen thirties is being dusted off for inspection as a possible "cure" for the current recession. The latest resurrection is something out of the files of the Temporary National Economic Committee: the idea of creating a series of government-owned "capital banks" designed to furnish "loans" in the form of federal stock purchases in small companies which are being "starved" for capital. According to one Senate Democratic leader, as quoted in the *Wall Street Journal*, "The Senate will definitely pass a capital bank bill of some sort." Well, we're against the notion—and particularly against the sort of verbal hocus-pocus that represents "government

partnership" as a "boon to private enterprise." But if we can't beat 'em, we want to join 'em. If the government would only buy some of *our* stock we could do wonders for the cause of "private enterprise," even to the point of rewriting the dictionary.

> The grand jury called to investigate the tax returns of Representative Adam Clayton Powell Jr. has four weeks to live. Fifty-nine weeks have gone by since it was last convened to hear evidence.

● The Corn Products Refining Company and the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union have negotiated a contract which breaks ground in the controversy between those who consider the union shop an infringement on the freedom of the individual and those who contend that the open shop caters to "free riders"—men who benefit from the union's work without paying for it. Under the contract, the company has agreed to withhold from the pay of its non-union employees and turn over to the union a sum equivalent to union dues. The company should have stipulated that it would withhold only that portion of the dues which benefits *all* employees—*i.e.*, the portion devoted to collective bargaining rather than, say, to social, "educational" and political activities. But at least this contract protects the non-unionist's job, and that is a step in the right direction.

● Miss Helen Hill Miller of the *New Republic* promises in the next weeks to solve the problem of where the money is going to come from to support American culture now that it is established national policy that to be rich is un-American. Where, Miss Miller wants to know, citing some interesting figures, are we going to find the future Morgans, Mellons, Rockefellers, Haydens, Huntingtons, etc., with taxes at 92 per cent? In 1929, 513 Americans had an income in excess of $1 million (dollars worth twice today's). Together, they enjoyed *after taxes* $1,132,098,814. In 1955, only 276 persons had an income in excess of one million, and their combined income *before taxes* was less than $600 million. Miss Miller, as we say, will canvass means of making up the shortages that have resulted from the elimination of the very rich. Why not increase the rich man's tax to *100* per cent, and have the government support culture? *Terrific* idea!

● NATIONAL REVIEW notes with regret that FRASCO, Charles Wesley Lowry's Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, is going along with the Administration in the effort to circumvent congressional opinion on foreign aid. Eric Johnston's recent "bipartisan" conference in Washington is described in a Foundation release as a "unique, patriotic gathering," which all should celebrate who believe "our country must wage peace and oppose the spiritual slavery of Communism with intelligence and maturity." Dr. Lowry ought to know better.

● From an AP dispatch from Tokyo: "Toru Higo announced his candidacy today for a seat in the Japanese House of Representatives on the following platform: 'Slaughter of all Americans in Japan; slaughter of all pro-American Japanese; destruction of United States military forces in Japan, and destruction of all United States diplomatic facilities in Japan.'" We hope the Honolable Toru Higo leads the way—by a kamikaze attack on the fist of some United States Marine.

Their Tests and Ours

There seems to be no further point in commenting on the way our publicists fall flat on their faces at each new Soviet move. That has become so well established a custom that we had better accept it as part of the pattern of the times, and try to forget about it. The headlines over Andrei Gromyko's declaration that Russia—just having completed its longest series—is halting nuclear tests until it sees fit to resume them, were about normal, so we won't complain.

It is harder to be patient with the idea that Gromyko's propaganda gambit should affect the conduct of U.S. policy. Why? The validity and purpose of our nuclear tests is not a derivative of the ups and downs of Soviet testing. Our tests are an essential part of a coherent and very long-term program. Among their current aims is fall-out-free nuclear explosions, an achievement that we have already approximated. To stop short of this line would be idiotic. The elimination of radioactive fall-out—a problem toward which the Soviet Union has shown notable indifference—is dictated by crucial humane as well as military considerations. A second objective is the development of strictly defensive weapons, especially those able to cope with ballistic missiles. (A remarkable story has it that our coming Pacific tests are going to experiment with explosions above the atmosphere that might release a permanent screen of roving neutrons which would home in to trigger missile warheads as they arched through.) And third, these tests, like those of the past several years, are directly related to peacetime applications that promise (as AEC Commissioner Willard Libby's recent Senate testimony outlined) amazing material benefits to all mankind.

Nor can we be impressed with the claim that Moscow has won a great propaganda victory by proving its "peaceful" as against our "warlike" intentions. Ordinary people are not quite so innocent as Liberals think. Over the years they have managed to draw a few conclusions of their own about Soviet behavior. And experience can show anyone willing to learn by experience that the U.S. gets along best internationally when it shows that it can make up its own mind what to do and when to do it.

So we adjure: Steady on, Messrs. Eisenhower-Dulles-Strauss! Keep your eye on your *own* atoms, whatever Khrushchev wants to do with his.

Smash Hit for the Reuther Troupe

The investigation by the Senate Rackets Committee of the Kohler strike is now "over." As things stand, it may be judged a considerable propaganda victory for Walter Reuther. Mr. Reuther is a very skillful controversialist, but by no means could he have scored as he did without the cooperation of his troupe —the Democratic Senators of the Committee, the Chief Counsel, and the press. Mr. Bozell detailed in last week's issue some of the techniques by which, acting as a common team, Mr. Reuther, the Senators, and the press contrived to obscure what strikes us as the central fact of the Kohler case, which is that Mr. Reuther's lieutenants, presumably acting under his explicit or implicit instructions (those that don't, don't get to be lieutenants) knuckledusted their way about Kohler, Wisconsin, cajoling, intimidating, and beating up workers and their families in a vain attempt to humble Herbert Kohler.

Since Mr. Bozell wrote, the final act has been played out. Mr. Kohler and Mr. Reuther both appeared, and made personal statements. Mr. Kohler's was short, stiff, pointed, undramatic; he was questioned thoroughly by the Senators and the staff, he answered their questions—and then he left. Reuther arrived like a visiting nabob, ascended his throne away from home, and lectured the docile Senators for *one hour and one half without interruption.* In the course of his proclamation, he admitted that here and there violence had occurred, a violence he deeply regretted—though less, one gathers, than he regrets the fact that anyone should, by doing other than Reuther willed, have invited that violence; and then on to the peroration about Mr. Kohler's aggressions against organized labor, in which he is encouraged by such reactionaries and moral cowards as Senator Goldwater, etc., etc.

So it went. Upon the minority members of the Committee, a serious responsibility devolves. Senators Goldwater and Curtis and Mundt (Senator Ives will, of course, go with the Democrats) are conscientious and able men, and they must write a report that summarizes the findings of the Kohler investigation with ruthless regard for the truth, which is to say with ruthless disregard for Reuther's feelings. This report will be a minority report, for the Democratic majority has plainly indicated what it will do. That minority report, we like to hope, will ultimately have the prestige that cannot be got by the majority's quantitative edge: for it will look the facts in the face, and set them down. Those facts are that it has become dangerous, economically, politically and physically, to oppose Walter Reuther.

Mercy Is Its Own Reward

Washington, March 31—Senator Pat McNamara, who has contended that recent hearings of the Senate rackets committee were "rigged against labor," quit that committee today.

New York Times

Though John McClellan (Arkansas) is apt to use the lash
When he discovers union chiefs a-swiping union cash,
The quality of mercy (which was Portia's favorite dish)
Is one pervading all the acts of McNamara (Mich.).
He is the last to cast a stone: instead, in accents pious,
He chides investigators for their anti-labor bias.

The goons of Mr. Reuther had a task to be fulfilled:
Some cars were burned, some homes were wrecked, a man or two were killed.
And Arizona's Goldwater and Mundt of South Dakota
Allowed as how the boys had gone and overdrawn their quota—
But McNamara (Michigan) says they're exaggerating
And he'll be damned if he'll go in for any labor-baiting.

Election Day, when Reuther's lads go forth to cast their vote,
I doubt that they will make an X for Mundt of S. Dakot';
And Arizona's Barry M. will never get their mark,
Nor will they cast a ballot for J. L. McClellan (Ark.)
These fished in muddy waters where no Senator should fish—
But, baby, will they stuff the box for McNamara (Mich.)!

MORRIE RYSKIND

The New York Times Debates an Issue

The *New York Times* is the most influential newspaper in this country, quite probably in the world. Its unparalleled journalistic apparatus brings to its columns a massive news coverage that constitutes a basic documentation of our age. It is our only national newspaper; and it is international also, for its audience, like its coverage, is world-wide. There are other papers, here and in Europe, with larger circulations than the *Times*' by far; but there is none that has a circulation of such weight. Every morning the *Times* lies on the breakfast table or office desk of every member of Congress, every important official of the executive branch, the higher judges, the ministers and correspondents of all foreign nations, the elite of the communications world, editors, college presidents, writers, preachers, professors.

The *New York Times*, that is to say, is a great power in the land, one of the formative factors in our nation's policy and character.

That influence it could never have attained but for a reputation for honesty, fairness, moderation.

In fact, the *Times*, while enjoying that reputation and reaping its abundant harvest, has, in its editorial columns, become scandalously irresponsible. The fact of its irresponsibility is not widely noticed precisely because of the contrary presumptions—because of its putative fairness. So that its readers do not bring to a reading of the *Times* their critical defenses, thus permitting to the *Times* the kind of outrageous abuse of its clientele that, in any lesser enterprise, would forever discredit it.

We undertake to prove our point by a painstaking examination of a typical recent editorial on a current controversy. We intend to prove that in editorializing on the Butler and Jenner Bills the *Times* uses smear, prejudice, oversimplification, slogans, and packaged thought—in lieu of fair analysis.

We are not questioning, on this occasion, the specific stand that the *Times* takes against the bill. We differ with that stand, but we know that there are many thoughtful citizens, including not a few conservatives, who oppose the Jenner-Butler proposal. We direct attention, not to the *position* taken by the *Times*, but to its way of handling itself, of "debating" the issue.

Herewith, in bold face type, a breakdown of the editorial, "Jenner-cum-Butler":

Since Senator Jenner's extremist bill to limit jurisdiction of the Supreme Court has been running into trouble, his brother-in-arms Senator Butler has come up with a proposal to accomplish the same ends by different means.

With what a casual air the rhetoric sets the mood! There they are, Jenner and Butler, the roughneck, weapon-swinging fanatics, sneaking through their extreme measures on the Bolshevik axiom that the end justifies the means! Now the *Times* knows (but does not remind most of its readers who do not know, or have forgotten) that the Jenner Bill even in its original form, which went considerably further than the Butler substitute, received the vote of *half* of the large Judiciary Committee, all of whose members are experienced lawyers, many of them with judicial service. The *Times* also knows (but does not tell its readers) that the nation's foremost constitutional scholar, Professor Edward S. Corwin, while refraining from an endorsement of the original Jenner Bill, *endorsed its motivation and called for just such an ap-*

New York Times, March 29, 1958

JENNER-CUM-BUTLER

Since Senator Jenner's extremist bill to limit jurisdiction of the Supreme Court has been running into trouble, his brother-in-arms Senator Butler has come up with a proposal to accomplish the same ends by different means.

Instead of imposing blanket restrictions on the court's appellate jurisdiction, as Mr. Jenner would do, Senator Butler would merely reverse a few of the decisions that he and Mr. Jenner don't like. They happen to include some of the most important civil liberties decisions made by the court in recent years, including the pre-eminently sensible one in the Cole case limiting Government dismissal of employes as security risks to those holding sensitive jobs. Instead of concentrating the Federal security-risk program on those areas where there may be a genuine question of national security, Maryland's senior Senator would expand it by law—just the opposite of what is needed. He would also put states into the anti-sedition business, which by rights and by court decision belongs to the Federal Government; and he would overturn the Watkins decision, which set some proper limits to the powers of Congressional investigating committees.

Not surprisingly, Senator Jenner is supporting the Butler amendment to his own bill. There is a chance that despite the efforts of Senator Hennings, a sturdy and unobtrusive fighter for civil liberties, the measure might get out of the Judiciary Committee, hardly noted in recent years for its liberalism. If it does, the bill deserves death on the floor of the Senate.

proach as the Butler substitute proposes—in a letter to the *New York Times!* And the *Times* knows (but does not remind us) that the dean of the country's liberal jurists, Judge Learned Hand, devoted last year's Holmes lectures at Harvard (reviewed a month ago in the *Times'* book section) to *a critique of the Warren Court's self-constitution as a super-legislature,* citing as misdeeds many of the decisions the Butler and Jenner Bills propose to correct.

Instead of imposing blanket restrictions on the court's appellate jurisdiction, as Mr. Jenner would do, Senator Butler would merely reverse a few of the decisions that he and Mr. Jenner don't like.

The original Jenner Bill proposed not "blanket restrictions" but defined and enumerated restrictions. The *Times,* of course, knows (but does not tell us) that it is *not* Senator Jenner, but Sections 1 and 2 of Article III of the Constitution that, for better or worse, put the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court into the hands of Congress.

Reverse a few of the decisions that he and Mr. Jenner don't like? Correct—but only on the supposition that a majority of the Congress, representing the will of the majority of the American people, don't like them either. Jenner and Butler are not proposing a *coup d'état.* They are proposing *legislation,* which, as *legislators,* it is presumably their privilege and duty to do, according to their own lights, and with reference to the desires of their constituencies. The fact that Senators Butler and Jenner, Justice Hand, and Professor Corwin oppose a few decisions that the *Times* favors, does not mean that, as legislators and critics, they should keep silent; or does it?

. . . the pre-eminently sensible [decision] in the Cole case limiting Government dismissal of employes as security risks . . .

"Sensible." That is, what sober, responsible citizens (like the *Times'* editors and everyone else except such wild men as Senators Jenner and Butler) would approve. James Madison, known as "the Father of the Constitution," declared an *unqualified* removal power to be solely "an executive power." That was in 1789. Until the Cole case, this view prevailed unchallenged with respect to executive officers appointed without legally fixed terms. Extending this principle even to civil service employes, Congress in 1946 and repeatedly thereafter, gave to agency heads the right, in their absolute discretion, to fire persons whose continued service, in their absolute discretion, was contrary to the national interest.

He would also put states into the anti-sedition business, which by rights and by court decision belongs to the Federal Government . . .

Kreuttner

"What do you mean, 'one-sided news coverage'? How can they give two sides of a question when it's perfectly obvious that there's only one side?"

Imaginative fellow, Butler—proposing something no one ever dreamed of before, to "put the states into the anti-sedition business." . . . Yet the *Times* knows (but does not tell its readers) that until the Steve Nelson decision of 1956 the states *have always been in the anti-sedition business;* and that by the Nelson decision the Court struck down anti-sedition laws at that moment on the books of forty-two states; and that the sponsor of the Smith Act (at issue in the Nelson case) had himself expressed, on the floor of Congress, the explicit congressional understanding that the Act would *not* supersede state laws in the same field. The first and only "court decision" that ever in the nation's history suggested that sedition was *not* properly a state concern was this same decision, the Nelson case, that the *Times* refers to in a perfect (but hidden) logical circle as an argument for itself.

. . . he would overturn the Watkins decision, which set some proper limits to the powers of Congressional investigating committees.

The *Times* knows (but does not tell us) that the new—and unprecedented—doctrine of the Watkins

decision was not a definition of "proper limits" in the sense of protecting a witness' constitutional rights or blocking a usurpation of judicial power, but a judicial declaration of how Congress should proceed in *its own* business of legislating, of which it is by Section 1 of Article I of the Constitution made the sole repository. In the series of Supreme Court decisions on investigations starting in 1821, Congress' power was never questioned before *Watkins*, nor was the right of Congress itself to decide whether and how investigations were related to the legislative process. Now tradition may conceivably have been wrong until June 1957. But to think otherwise would not seem enough to place one beyond the bounds of rational mankind.

Not surprisingly, Senator Jenner is supporting the Butler amendment to his own bill.

Not surprisingly—? Senator Jenner travels from a "bad" measure to a "less bad" one. Why is that "not surprising" if one assumes the worse the measure, the more likely Senator Jenner is to support it? We do not understand—except that there is a connotation in the rhetoric injurious to Senator Jenner and that, for the *Times*, is sufficient reason.

There is a chance that despite the efforts of Senator Hennings, a sturdy and unobtrusive fighter for civil liberties . . .

Ah, the tragic lot of these austere heroes of the Liberal pantheon! Tirelessly working in the cause of liberty against rising despotism, albeit so modestly that the public scarcely knows their names, much less their daily sacrifices.

. . . the Judiciary Committee, hardly noted in recent years for its liberalism.

Define liberalism as siding with the *Times*. Which the Committee did, by the way, in overwhelmingly endorsing the President's nomination to the Supreme Court of those outstandingly illiberal gentlemen, Earl Warren and William Brennan.

. . . the bill deserves death . . .

Of course. As with all things outlawed, murderous, only *execution*—not just "a negative vote," "disapproval," "rejection"—can satisfy the demands of the higher justice.

As last item in the list, a most eloquent omission. Not a word, in the editorial, of the Konigsberg case, singled out as the primary issue in the Butler substitute. Here too the *Times* cannot be unaware that 95 per cent of American lawyers, whatever their views on the other matters, consider *Konigsberg*, in which the Court dictated to the states the terms on which lawyers should be admitted to the State Bars, an arrogant and intolerable usurpation.

We repeat that our purpose here is not to argue in favor of the Jenner-Butler Bill. There are serious arguments against the Bill, but they are not to be found in the *Times*. Here there is no analysis, or evidence (on the contrary, there is palpable suppression of evidence). There is no discussion, or debate. There is no examination of the theoretical argument that one branch of government is encroaching upon the rights of others. There is merely aggressive and question-begging rhetoric; an endeavor to thrust the entire issue, so serious for the future of the nation, beyond the limits of debate.

The *Times* rhetoric is thus in its essence totalitarian. Those who differ with the *Times* are not merely mistaken, but enemies of the people, whose opposition is to be met with a rhetorical purge. The *Times* thereby repudiates the conception of the discussion process that is the dividing line between a free and a despotic society.

If it chooses so to conduct its affairs, let it do so; but let it surrender, or be forced to surrender, its pretensions.

Heave-Ho for Pearson

The smashing defeat of Canada's Liberal Party under the leadership of Lester Pearson would be grounds, in any case, for dancing in the streets, for Pearson ("Nehru in a homburg") has long been a deadly enemy of the true interests of the West. But what gives his collapse its special zest is the fact that the international Liberal apparatus had done its damnedest for him.

For years his arrival at Harvard, or at the UN, or at any of a score of Liberal dovecotes on both shores of the Atlantic, had dependably produced a flutter of cooing admiration. Short months ago he was garlanded with the Nobel Peace Prize—appeasement's Iron Cross. And during the Canadian election campaign the Liberal press corps in Ottawa lied itself blue in the face, in the teeth of all the evidence, to make Pearson sound like a winner, or at any rate a hot contender.

Luckily, the voters of Canada had other ideas. We congratulate Mr. Diefenbaker and hope he rewards the nation with freedom, prosperity, and resolution in the face of the Soviet challenge.

Our Contributors—ROBERT V. JONES ("The Soviet Price System") is a Chicago lawyer who has, in the past, taught economics, business and government at Northwestern University, and in 1945 served with the U.S. Group of the Control Council for Germany. He is the author of *The Challenge of Liberty* (Heritage Foundation, Inc.).

The Soviet Price System

The Soviet Union has a price system, as all nations do: but it does not implement Marxist ideology, and is bureaucratically fixed, and prodigiously wasteful

ROBERT V. JONES

Karl Marx had a great deal to say about the deficiencies of the price system under private capitalism. But he had little or nothing to say about the price system that would be used in his Communist Utopia. Every society, however, must employ a price mechanism of some kind if it is to rise above barter; and Soviet Russia has accordingly been compelled to develop a system of prices. In doing so it has encountered difficulties which Marx, who was not much concerned with the practical details of his ideal society, never foresaw or discussed.

What is the Soviet price system? How does it work? How does it affect welfare?

The system in use is one of price-fixing by the State. The bureaucracy sets the prices of all goods and the wages of all labor. Since the State is the only seller of goods and the only employer of labor, the Soviet citizen has no choice but to pay the prices and to accept the wages established by the officials of the government.

How do the Communist officials go about determining particular prices and wages?

The visitor to Russia, if he were at all versed in Marxian theory, would expect prices to be determined by wage costs; or, to put the matter the other way around, he would expect that workers would receive in their wages the entire price of the product of their labor. A principal part of Marx's criticism of private enterprise was that the worker did not receive a wage equal to the entire value of the product his labor had created. His wage amounted to only a part of the value of his product, and over and above his wage there was a surplus-value which did not go to the worker but to his employer. This, Marx said, was robbery; the entire value of the product should go to the laborer, and the diversion of surplus-value to the employer amounted to stealing from the worker that which was rightfully his. But observation of prices in Russia today shows beyond any doubt that the Soviet worker often receives much less than the full value of his product, and that a large surplus-value, or profit, goes to the employer, *i.e.*, the State. The visitor to Russia does not have, of course, any close knowledge of costs of particular goods; but he can relate wage scales to prices, and the relation shows clearly that many prices, as they are set by the bureaucracy, do not go entirely to labor, but leave the State a handsome profit.

The wage of a skilled factory worker is about 1,000 rubles a month. From this there is deducted a tax which varies with the worker's circumstances but which usually amounts to about 100 rubles, leaving a net wage cost of about 900 rubles. The net wages of other laborers range down to about 500 rubles a month. Hours of labor vary, but seem usually to be approximately 180 to 200 per month. Wage costs, therefore, run from about 3 rubles per hour for unskilled labor to 5 rubles or slightly more for skilled labor.

Contrast these wage costs with the following prices: men's suits, 1,000 to 2,000 rubles; men's shoes, 250 to 700 rubles; women's nylon hose, 25 to 35 rubles; women's slips, 150 to 225 rubles; bread, 2½ rubles per loaf. These prices are representative of the general level of prices for clothing and food. All these prices are obviously very high in relation to the wages expended in production. A man's suit cannot possibly involve as much as 200 hours of skilled labor or 300 hours of unskilled labor, nor can a loaf of bread represent a half hour of skilled labor or nearly an hour of unskilled labor.

On the other hand, some prices, notably rent, seem low. A three-room apartment in a new building in Moscow rents for about 100 rubles a month, which must be below cost if depreciation be taken into account. Furthermore, a few services, particularly education and medical care, are rendered with little or no charge.

It is clear, therefore, that Soviet prices are not based upon cost, that the Soviet worker does not receive in his wage the value of his product, and that in this as in so many other things the Communist society has found it necessary to repudiate Marx. What then is the controlling principle, resulting simply from caprice or custom?

No Government Deficit

Upon consideration it is apparent that the following principle must govern the structure of Soviet prices and wages as a whole: The income of the Soviet State must be kept equal to its expenditures. The State must recover from its citizens in one way or another all the rubles it pays out, so that over a period of time income and outgo will be in balance. If some services, such as education, medicine and military defense, are operated at a loss, other activities must be operated at an offsetting profit. For to operate at a deficit is far more dangerous to a Soviet State than to a free enterprise state, for reasons to be presented in a moment.

The income of the Soviet State consists primarily in prices received for consumers' goods sold to citizens. Some taxes are also collected, but these are principally taxes on wages (the Soviet citizen has little else that can be taxed), and since these taxes are deducted from wages paid by the State, they are no more than a bookkeeping operation determining net wages. The expenditure of the Soviet State consists primarily in wages paid

for services rendered by citizens. Nearly every adult in Russia is an employee of the State, for the State is the only employer (the "collective" farms are not a real exception to this proposition); and his income consists in the wages which the State chooses to pay him. The State has little other expense, for it does not buy cannon or planes for its armies, or supplies for its factories; it owns all goods and products and simply transfers them from one branch or segment of its organization to another. Wages, then, are almost its only expenditure.

It is of vital importance to the Soviet State not to permit its expenditures in wages to exceed on the average its income from prices and taxes. The financing of such an excess of expenditures over income would of itself present no problem, for it would simply involve the printing of more paper rubles. But if such an excess of expenditures over income were allowed to occur, the excess would become a stock of hoarded money in the hands of Soviet citizens. For their wages would be in excess of what they would be paying back to the State in prices and taxes, and the excess would remain in their hands as a growing accumulation of rubles.

Private hoards of money, however, are extremely dangerous to a Communistic economy, threatening its very existence. For they lead inevitably to a black market in goods, and a black market is a free market, where buyers and sellers set their own prices. But a free market, to the extent that it is permitted to exist, destroys Communism. Communism cannot exist where people are allowed to trade as they please. Its essence is central planning and the controls that are necessary to make central planning work.

The only way to prevent a black market is to prevent private hoards of money from accumulating. Communist societies have tried to combat private hoarding by making it unlawful for any citizen to have more than a limited amount of money in his possession. But this has proved ineffective, as shown by the fact that time and again Communist societies have issued decrees outlawing existing paper currency and requiring its surrender in exchange for a new currency in limited amount. By this process any unlawful hoards of the old currency are destroyed, for the holders dare not disclose them. The latest instance of such a decree was that issued by the Communist government of East Germany in the fall of 1957. But these monetary decrees come after the event, and to that extent are ineffective, and they are also dangerous because they create resentment and distrust. Further, they are a public confession of weakness and mistake.

Recapturing Ivan's Rubles

The only satisfactory way for the Communist State to avoid private hoarding of currency is to adjust its prices and wages to such a pattern that the prices charged by the State will be sure to recapture from each citizen all the rubles that he has received as compensation for his services. It is difficult to arrange such a structure of prices and wages, for it cannot be built pursuant to any blueprint made in advance, but must result from slow experiment. The difficulty is attested by the frequency of the monetary reforms which have been decreed. Accordingly, when a structure of prices and wages seems to be working satisfactorily, with the desired result of balancing income and expenditure, it is dangerous from the standpoint of the Soviet State to make modification in it.

But the operation of this basic principle works as a heavy brake upon the Soviet economy. It means that all change in the Soviet economy must be made very slowly, for rapid or extensive change might upset the balance of income and expenditure. Suppose, for example, that the government wished to lower the price of bread to 1½ rubles per loaf, which would probably still be above cost. This would not increase the consumption of bread very much, and every family in Russia would have many rubles per month which it formerly spent for bread but could now use for something else. Will this money be hoarded, or will it be spent to buy other goods from the government? To avoid hoarding, the government must have other goods available for sale and it must be able to induce the citizens to buy them. But the government cannot be sure of the result in advance of the experiment.

Or suppose that the government should wish to improve the quality of shoes, which are now poor in quality and quickly wear out. An improvement in quality would mean increased expenditure, and it would also mean that shoes would be worn longer, so that fewer would be purchased. Can the price be so adjusted that the fewer good shoes will bring as many rubles into the State's pocket as the larger number of poor shoes? Nothing but experimentation over a substantial period of time can supply the answer. But such experimentation is dangerous and must be conducted cautiously. And so it is throughout the entire Soviet economy. The cumbrous price mechanism, which can move its ponderous weight only a bit at a time, retards all progress.

It is true, of course, that within a very limited area the Soviet government can move rapidly, more rapidly upon occasion than a free government. The Soviet State, for example, can divert the application of resources from one military field to another very quickly. It can rapidly shift its effort from cannon to missiles, or from tanks to bombers, and it can realign industrial production in support of the changed emphasis. But this is because such changes do not materially affect either the wages paid out by the State or its income. The Soviet State cannot quickly change its over-all military program, however, either up or down, without running grave danger of destroying Communistic control of the economy as a whole.

Apart from such limited areas, change comes slowly in Russia. One sees everywhere the effects of this built-in resistance of the Soviet economy to change. Eight- and nine-story apartment buildings, for example, are still built of thick masonry walls without benefit of steel or reinforced concrete framework. This brake on progress is a serious defect in the Soviet price system.

A second defect is the difficulty it creates in estimating the effectiveness of productive activity. In a free market there are two ways of judging the efficiency of an operation: One is by visual inspection and the other is by examination of a profit-and-loss statement. Of the two, the second is much the more valuable. It tells, in a free market, the productivity

of the operation in terms of the satisfaction of human wants and its cost in terms of human sacrifice or effort.

But in the Soviet system profit-and-loss statements are almost meaningless. The prices received do not measure want-satisfaction, nor do the wages paid measure sacrifice or effort. For the prices and the wages have been fixed arbitrarily and have no objective meaning. The Soviet administrator therefore can learn very little about the efficiency of any plant, shop, or other segment of the economy by examining its operating statement.

He is compelled, accordingly, to rely on visual inspection of the operating process, whatever it may be. Such visual inspection, however, is time-consuming, must be almost continuously exercised, and has limited utility. It can advise whether a process is being conducted in a technically efficient way, but it cannot advise whether it is being conducted in a socially efficient way, that is, whether its cost is below the value of its product. The Soviet administrator, being without either the help or the criticism of an operating statement, tends to become wasteful in the use of labor, and evidence of such waste can be seen everywhere in Russia. The visitor accustomed to American economy in the use of labor can only be appalled at some of the wastage of labor which he sees.

This inefficient use of labor means that earning power is kept lower than it otherwise would be, and that the standard of living is lower.

A third defect of the Soviet price system is that it gives no information, to the administrators who are charged with the direction of the Soviet economy, on available resources. One of the important functions of a free market is to advise, through the medium of current price, of the relative scarcity or plenty in the supply of particular goods in relation to the need for them. Two years ago, for example, the free market told the American businessman that copper and lead were relatively scarce commodities, and he had to make his production and expansion plans accordingly. Today, on the other hand, the free market tells him that these metals are relatively plentiful and he can plan on that basis. The Soviet administrator, however, has no such market information. He can know the availability of copper, lead, and all other resources only through statistical information which is expensive to compile, can seldom be complete, and is indeed out of date by the time it is accumulated.

This want of market information on resources is particularly harmful when any substantial change or expansion in production is planned. How do Soviet administrators know whether the resources for the changed program will be available? Only by the slow process of counting, which may take months to accomplish. The American businessman gets the same information by a few telephone calls in which he inquires the state of the markets for particular commodities. This lack of ready information on resources is another feature of the Soviet price system which acts as a severe drag on change and progress.

Consumers Don't Matter

Lastly, the Soviet price system fails to give information on what people need. In a free market consumers express their wants by bidding for particular goods, and as prices for particular goods rise or fall producers adjust their production accordingly. The Soviet administrative bureaucracy can obtain no such information from the price mechanism, for they themselves have set all the prices. They are consequently compelled to order production in accordance with their own ideas of what people ought to have, rather than in accordance with needs as consumers themselves believe those needs to exist. The Soviet administrators know, to be sure, that consumers need food, clothing and housing, but within these broad categories they do not know the particular varieties of goods of which consumers have the most need. The result is that the Soviet citizen has very little opportunity for self-expression in his use of the material things of life. He eats the food, wears the clothing, and occupies the housing that is ordered for him, and he must continue this stultifying process day after day and year after year.

The bureaucracy, furthermore, in actual practice makes terrible mistakes in determining what people need. It has, for example, spent tens of thousands of man-hours in building palatial stations for the Moscow subway, lining the walls with beautiful stonework, decorating the ceilings with mosaics, and ornamenting the platforms with statuary, while the people of Moscow live in extremely overcrowded housing. The minimum rate of occupancy is five people to a three-room apartment. Likewise the bureaucracy is just completing in Moscow a lavish year-round exposition of industry and agriculture, with a vast number of permanent buildings beautifully constructed of fine materials, representing a far greater expenditure of labor than any exposition in this country. Yet a fairly substantial portion of the people of Moscow still live in one- and two-story buildings constructed long ago of logs. Instances of this kind can be multiplied. Every society, of course, makes mistakes in its use of its productive resources, but in the society of free prices and wages such glaring mistakes as those seen in Russia are rare. They will continue to be made in Russia, however, as long as Communism continues.

Communism cannot abandon its price system. It is the only system consistent with Communism. When it is abandoned, Communism will go. And as long as it is retained it will make inevitable, because of its built-in defects, a standard of living in Russia substantially below that in other countries with similar natural resources and technological knowledge.

The Liberal Line...

WILLMOORE KENDALL

Dogmatic Relativism

One of the many virtues of American politics is that we in this country believe in *both* majority-rule and minority-right.

We are, to be sure, constantly being told that we must choose between the two, and remake our institutions accordingly. We must, for instance, get rid of the filibuster: it frustrates the will of the majority. We must abolish the electoral college: it gives us Presidents who cannot point to a majority mandate for their policies. We must bid farewell to our traditional political parties: they fail to draw sharp issues at election time, and thus make it impossible for the majority will to express itself. Or, conversely, we are told that we must cling to and re-enforce these things: they are bulwarks against "majority tyranny," the indispensable guarantees of our "rights" as American citizens. But we turn a deaf ear to the "majoritarians" and the anti-majoritarians, and for good reason: We want to be majoritarians, on and on through an indefinite future, when we think the majority is, or is about to be, right, and anti-majoritarians when we find ourselves in, or with, the minority. That is the game of American politics as we have always played it, and intend—or so this columnist likes to believe—to keep on playing it.

That is why the Liberals, increasingly committed as they are to all-out majority-rule, to the idea that the rights of the minority are merely the rights the majority chooses to concede to them, *and that that is just as it should be,* are something new under the sun of American politics, and it is why such a book as Currin Shields' *Democracy and Catholicism in America* (McGraw-Hill, $5.00), the first full-dress attempt by an American to state a "case" for majority-rule, is long overdue. It deserves, execrably bad political theory though it is, the most serious possible attention as a portent of things to come. The Liberal propaganda machine has been needing a Shields—that is, a political theorist foolish enough to take on the task, impossible on the face of it, of proving that majority-rule is a good thing. The machine now has one; and we may safely predict that it will, by adopting his argument over the years, make the most of him. Let us, then, listen to what he has to say.

The Framers "Tricked" Us

Decisions about the exercise of a "community's authority," states Mr. Shields flatly, "should be determined by a vote of a majority of [its] members." The members—all of them presumably—should regard such a decision as the "decision of the entire community." Because the majority has a "right" to rule? Well, no: to put it that way would be to withdraw our attention from the interesting and important question, namely, "What form of decision-making is likely to lead to the most desirable 'effects'?" We must not let ourselves fall for the "trick" played upon the American people by the Framers of their Constitution.

What trick? Well, first the Framers equated "legitimate authority" with "constitutionality," and then they "substituted the principle of constitutionality for the principle of majority rule," with the result that officials in the United States are "bound by the higher law of the Constitution rather than by a mandate from the majority of the people." What is wrong with our Constitution, in other words, is that it forbids the majority to "exercise authority contrary to constitutional provision," and, on top of that, "discourages" the majority from pressing any wish on its part to change the Constitution. The Constitution, in a word, "restrains" majority-rule; and that, in practice, has always meant restraint of the majority either by a mere minority, a violation of the "principle of political equality," or by some authority "outside and independent of the community," a violation of the "principle of popular sovereignty."

No "Source of Authority"

The restraints, then, have to go; and along with them, all attempts by present majorities to bind the hands of future majorities, since—insists Mr. Shields—"if it is legitimate to adopt restraints by majority vote, it is legitimate to abolish them in the same way," and since, again, restraints imply that "the authority to make a decision affecting the community is not located in [its] membership." Judicial review, for example, must go; and the whole "principle of constitutionality" must go, too. A constitution is not, properly, "a legalistic device for muffling the expression of popular desires"; a constitution is nothing more nor less than a "convenient evidence of agreements shared by the members of a constituted political community."

We must, then, declares Shields, get away from the whole "source of authority" approach, and face *ab initio* the key question: "Why should a minority consent to a majority's decision?" And the answer to that question is, quite simply, this: "no member of a community knows with certainty what is right"; that being the case, "two heads are better than one, and many better than a few"; and the majority is, *a fortiori,* "more likely than a minority to make the right decision."

What if the majority uses its power merely to impose its private desires? Shields has, it soon appears, no answer, but also no intention to lose any sleep over the problem: "A decision about exercising authority determined by a majority vote is more likely to advance the general welfare of a community than a decision made according to any alternative principle." Two heads are better than one, remember?

Well, there you have it—all naked, be it noted, in its reliance upon dogmatic relativism. But the Liberal propaganda machine couldn't use it if it relied on anything else.

The Evolution of a Conservative

After twelve years in the Communist Utopia the author found Western liberalism turned statist, and himself a conservative

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

Human decisions sometimes produce unexpected consequences. I would probably never have appreciated the values of conservatism if I had not decided, as a young and obscure free-lance writer in 1922, to go to Moscow. At that time, although I was not a member of the Communist Party, I was a convinced sympathizer with the Soviet regime, a devout fellow-traveler. I went to Moscow in the spirit of the Moslem making his pilgrimage to Mecca.

Twelve years later I left Moscow with completely transformed ideas of what Soviet Communism meant in practice, with unforgettable memories of cruelties visited on many Russians whom I knew and uncounted millions whom I did not know. Instead of liberation I had found a tyranny far worse than that of the Czars; instead of my early vision of workers freed from so-called capitalist exploitation and advancing to ever higher standards of living, I took away memories of workers and peasants far more "ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed" than the most "underprivileged" Americans. My original conception of the Communist Party as a dedicated élite had melted away as I watched this party, in power, appropriate to itself the luxury living standards of the pre-revolutionary high bureaucracy.

Looking back to my fellow-traveler phase I see its roots in a profoundly negative attitude toward the First World War. But even allowing for the widespread emotional revulsion against the governments and societies which all seemed responsible for such a disaster to Western civilization as the war proved, it seems surprising, in retrospect, that I swallowed so easily the political and economic implications of the Communist creed, particularly since in my school and college years I had been a pronounced individualist. My literary hero had been Ibsen's Dr. Stockman, "the enemy of the people," whose last proud boast was: "He stands strongest who stands most alone."

I think part of the explanation may be found in my education. I attended an excellent preparatory school and one of the best small liberal arts colleges in the United States. But not a single course gave me an insight into the nature and possible abuses of political power; no one taught me the desirability of individual property ownership as the only means of avoiding undue concentration of State power. In my formative years, 1910-1917, the American political and economic system was so much taken for granted that there was little impulse to interpret and vindicate it. There was no sense of challenge by radically different systems in foreign lands. This the Soviet Union was to provide.

Classical Liberalism

When I completed the first stage of my retreat from Moscow, the rejection of Soviet Communism, of Marxism, of the State-planned economy, I considered myself a liberal. I had been brought up on Whig and Liberal interpretations of history; Greene and Macaulay had been my mentors. What I sympathized with and still sympathize with is the classical liberalism which finds expression in the works of John Locke, Adam Smith, Montesquieu and Lord Acton. This seemed to provide the bases of the good society: a State strictly limited in its functions, maximum freedom for the individual to go as far as his desire and ability will carry him; protection for the individual against all forms of tyranny, including the tyranny of the majority; a minimum of bureaucratic administration. But during the twelve years which I had spent in Russia this classical liberalism had lost ground in the countries which had once been its strongholds, the United States and Great Britain.

With what hoots of derision did the "liberal," modern style, greet Locke's insistence on man's natural rights of "life, liberty and property," or his idea that security of property is "the great and chief end of men's uniting into commonwealths." How dreadfully old-fashioned, to these thinkers, was Adam Smith's dictum that "every man is by nature first and principally recommended to his own care."

In the light of a Soviet background of observation, the historic liberal identification of free trade with free thought, of political liberty with economic liberty was highly convincing. Yet these were repudiated in the very countries where classical liberalism was once most powerful. The British Liberal Party, which gave the country so many Prime Ministers up to the time of the First World War, had shrunk to a tiny remnant. And this remnant had no clear, solid basis of agreement within itself: while some looked back a little wistfully to the time when liberalism was a doctrine of economic individualism, others followed the new god of State economic planning.

The good ship liberalism in the United States had suffered an even sadder fate. It had been boarded and captured by a pirate crew of State interventionists and near-socialists. Liberals in twentieth-century America had forsaken the historic liberal philosophy. While economy and retrenchment in government spending used to be constant liberal watchwords, the New Deal American Liberal had become, on principle, a profligate spender of public funds for any and all purposes, and sometimes merely for the sake of spending. If he was free from the cynicism of a Harry Hopkins, with his scheme for buying the votes of the people with

their own money ("Tax, tax, tax; spend, spend, spend; elect, elect, elect"), he was a super-Keynesian, convinced that the cure for all economic and social difficulties is for the government to write a bigger check.

There had also been a significant shift in attitude toward the State since the early days of the American Republic. Immediately after the Revolution it was the Federalists, the more conservative of the two principal parties, who favored a relatively strong central government, although well provided with checks and balances against the emergence of tyranny. It was the Jeffersonian Republicans, the political progenitors of the Democratic Party, who stood most strongly for limiting the competence of the federal government. But with the inauguration of the New Deal the American Left took to extolling the virtues of strong central government, of the "affirmative" State.

In the past, liberalism had been associated with the struggle of the individual to free himself from State dictation. But one of the hallmarks of what now passed for liberalism was sponsorship of laws and judicial rulings that overrode deep-rooted local sentiments and flouted the right of the individual to dispose of his property as he saw fit.

Modern Conservatism

After returning to the United States, following eighteen years of work abroad as a correspondent, I came to the conclusion that anyone who believes that the main twin purposes of government are to maintain liberty under law and to assure each individual maximum freedom of personal and economic development cannot call himself a Liberal. So, by a process of elimination and evolution, I found myself a conservative. I found in conservatism the values especially needed in an age of what Ortega y Gasset has called the revolt of the masses, when the equality of men threatens to impair the quality of man.

Conservative thinkers, from Burke to the present time, have been skeptical of utopian schemes, and our age has been a graveyard of utopias. Who can believe in the natural goodness and perfectibility of man in a time that has seen the horrors of totalitarian tyranny? Who can feel confident that violent crime is only a product of bad social conditions when mounting crime and juvenile delinquency have gone hand in hand with full employment and a high material standard of living?

Conservatism is the surest guaranty of liberty today because the perils to liberty come not from the Right, but from the Left. The pressure against free institutions comes not only from Soviet and Chinese Communism but also from societies where the Welfare State has been pushed to a point where incentives disappear and economic collapse is imminent.

It is in the writings of the great conservatives in politics and economics that one finds the most convincing refutation of the utopian sophistries of Rousseau-Robespierre and Marx-Lenin. There is much in common between French Jacobinism and Soviet Communism; and Burke's "Reflections on the Revolution in France" remains the best field piece against both.

Western socialist parties have foresworn Communism, and some individual Socialists have an honorable record in combating Communism. But there is so much similarity between the long-range economic objectives of socialism and Communism that socialist opposition to Communism almost inevitably speaks with a quavering voice. Socialist parties continue to press for appeasement of the Soviet Union and for summit conferences, despite the USSR's remarkably consistent record of perfidy.

It is the conscious conservative, with his respect for religion and nationalism, his ingrained suspicion of revolutionary shortcuts, his sense of history, his unconditional rejection of economic collectivism, who is firmest in his opposition to the greatest contemporary threat to liberty, Communism.

Apart from Communism, the most formidable enemy of liberty in modern times is the leviathan State. There was a time when conservatism might have been identified with the strong State; but this is not true today. Conservatism has always included belief in the morality and utility of private ownership of property, which now, more than ever, must be considered a prerequisite of ordered freedom. And conservatives in America are in the forefront of the struggle against pillaging the thrifty for the benefit of the thriftless, against confiscatory taxation for purposes of social and economic leveling, against the passing of legislation that denies the individual's right to choose his tenants and his neighbors, against all the other usurpations and excesses of the leviathan State.

Man and the State

Conservatism has taken up the struggle for positions which liberalism has abandoned. Most conservatives today respect the ideas of John Locke and Adam Smith, as well as those of Burke. It is a safe assumption that Locke and Smith influenced Robert A. Taft more than they did Franklin D. Roosevelt.

So the intellectual end-station on my retreat from Moscow was a commitment to the principles of conservatism. I could not be attracted to socialism, because, even if it were possible to reach the socialist goal without violence, the goal itself did not seem desirable. One of my clearest and strongest reactions to what I saw and experienced in the Soviet Union was a passionate negative revulsion against State management of economic affairs.

Liberalism would have seemed more attractive if it had remained true to its nineteenth-century principles. But in England liberalism had become self-contradictory, and in the U.S. it had sold its intellectual birthright for a mess of Statist pottage.

There remained conservatism as a political faith and I became increasingly convinced that this was my faith as I became more familiar with the classics of conservative political thought. The conservative outlook on the nature of man, on the most hopeful means of reconciling liberty with order, on the proper balance between government and citizen, on moral and esthetic standards, is particularly congenial in a century that has experienced two revolts against Western civilization itself, one of them very much alive. It is under the conservative banner, I believe, that all who believe that the State was made for man, not man for the State, can most hopefully rally.

Letter from the Continent

E. v. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN

No Economic Crisis in Europe

In spite of the recession in the United States, there is very little evidence of an economic crisis in free Europe. It is true that in most countries the rate of expansion has slowed down, that in Germany a minor wave of strikes has set in (the trade unions, after all, must show some results for the membership dues they are getting), and that France is having her usual troubles. Yet the general expectation is that the Brussels Fair will offer to the world at large a splendid testimony to the youthfulness, dynamism, and optimism of the Old World.

And although most of Europe's professional economists are carefully scanning the horizon for signs of a severe downward trend, they expect it nowhere—except in shipping. For some time criticism has been mounting in Europe of the "cheap flags"—the boats, many of them tramp steamers, flying the flags of Panama, Liberia, Honduras, Costa Rica, and other countries which do not insist on the same high standards of wages and social security as the European and North American countries. Before the war, the "cheap flag" nations owned one per cent of the total tonnage in commercial shipping, as against 15 per cent today. The Cunard Line estimates that it could have saved, during the past seven years, about 39 million dollars in taxes had it made use of foreign subsidiaries. Some German ports (like Bremen) have become positively unfriendly toward boats sailing under "cheap flags"; shipowners and maritime unions alike are worried about these developments and some tax measures now seem to be in the offing.

Several strikes, needless to say, are pending in France, a country whose economy is as sound as its finances are shaky. The production index of France today is nearly twice as high as it was in 1937, which certainly is no sign of stagnation or decline. The workers are better off than ever before, their standard of living (except for housing) has improved considerably, and the Communist Party of France is thriving merely on the "loyalty" of its members, a sentimental trend quite typical of France where labels often survive changes in contents. Even the French *patronage*, the employers, are gradually changing their outlook to believe that a policy of high salaries after the American pattern should be introduced, because it would make the worker a full consumer and buyer, which in turn would spin the wheel of free enterprise more rapidly.

French Worker No "Bourgeois"

In France much must still be done about the re-education of the high-salaried workers toward the "bourgeois" way of life which, from their income, they have every right to lead. A visit to German workers' quarters and a perfunctory survey of their way of life would lead to the conclusion that they have a much higher actual income than the French "proletariat." The German worker directs his efforts toward a middle-class way of life. The French worker, partly influenced by political slogans and partly by his happy-go-lucky ways, still continues without good reason to lead his old lower-class existence, spending enormous amounts not so much on drink as on very good food, putting little money aside and investing equally little in durable (household) goods.

When, about five years ago, an American economist told some French colleagues that France's most important problem was housing for the workers, he was contradicted by a Frenchman who called him naive and said flatly that if French workers were given new and modern apartments they would turn them into pigsties almost overnight. The American visitor thereupon commented dryly that such language would be tolerated in only one other country in the world, the least socially-minded under the sun —the USSR. Most of the Frenchmen merely smiled, and after they had left the American inquired who his interlocutor had been. "Didn't you know? He is the Minister of Labor." "You don't tell me! What Party does he belong to?" "He's a Socialist."

Transportation Speeded

Yet, whatever the velleities of Europe's workers today, construction (rather than reconstruction) goes on at an even pace. The Germans continue to build their super-highways in four areas (two of them near the French frontier), and even the Austrian *Autobahn* from Salzburg to Vienna is slowly but surely getting under way, so that in a few years one will be able to zoom from the Dutch border to the easternmost segment of the Iron Curtain. The same can be said of the electrification of the railroads. By 1960 the Amsterdam-Vienna run across three nations will be complete. In Italy unemployment is not decreasing; in view of the high birthrate (now exceeded by prosperous France) it is a miracle that it does not increase.

Even Spain's economy is expanding, especially its iron and steel industry in the Bilbao region; yet the country's allegedly totalitarian government is frequently menaced by strikes and shows itself incapable of controlling prices, which soar after every increase in wages. The latest strike, however, has come not from the workers but from the medical students. Several medical faculties have closed their doors, and it remains to be seen what sort of pressure the government is going to use against the students. The reason for the upheaval lies in the new decree that doctors, before being allowed to practice, have to spend two years as interns in hospitals. Since the study of medicine takes seven years in Spain (as against five in most other Continental countries) the students are indignant about this imposition. It means that they would be 27 years old before they could earn a peseta. The same general situation prevails in the United States, but Spaniards are a very different breed from Americans. What a certain segment of one nation takes lying down will bring the same one in another country to its feet.

Letter from London

ANTHONY LEJEUNE

What the British Didn't Learn from Munich

"Keep it up! We're winning," cried this week's banner headline in the extreme left-wing weekly, *Tribune,* a paper which used to be called Bevanite until Mr. Bevan's hopes of office clothed him in the uniform of comparative respectability. What *Tribune's* readers are winning is the campaign to ban nuclear weapons. This campaign brings together a remarkable concourse of pacifists and fire-eaters in Britain and on the Continent.

Last week we had an anti-nuclear warfare tract by Mr. J. B. Priestley in the form of a new television play called *Doomsday for Dyson;* an announcement by that tough trade union leader, Mr. Frank Cousins, taking time off from the busmen's pay claim, that he supported official Labor policy on nuclear weapons only as an interim measure toward complete renunciation: and an extraordinary book by a Tory M. P., Sir Stephen King-Hall, called *Defense in the Nuclear Age.*

Sir Stephen accepts the need for defense and the danger of Soviet aggression but claims that, as suicide can hardly be reckoned a satisfactory form of defense, what Britain should do is renounce all weapons both nuclear and conventional, close the American bases and, having thus secured the good will and moral leadership of the world, prepare in cold blood for a nation-wide policy of passive resistance in case the Russians should decide to occupy the British Isles. Such a prospect, he thinks, would gravely alarm the Kremlin. Mr. Priestley says that he hopes everyone will read this book. It certainly has to be read to be believed.

Mr. Selwyn Lloyd was almost universally condemned recently for making a very bad speech in a foreign affairs debate. That it was a bad speech is true, but it wasn't as bad as all that. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd's real crime was that he took a gloomy view of the international situation, was reluctant to trust the Russians and too anxious to cooperate with the Americans. He could have won golden opinions by attacking American policy, calling for a new effort to make friends with the Kremlin and declaring that Britain would never take orders from Mr. Dulles.

"Everybody shoots at Alphonse," said an old music hall joke; well, nowadays everybody shoots at John Foster Dulles. He has only to appear on the stage and we all boo. The cartoons show him as a refrigerator freezing attempts at peace, as a workman digging a pit between Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Khrushchev. Mr. Dulles may not be the most tactful or subtle of diplomats but he is an honest man, and a staunch fighter against Communism: and for that reason the vacillating, compromise-loving world condemns him.

Whatever the domestic shortcomings of the present government, it has no illusions about the Russians and sets a properly high value on the Atlantic Alliance. But popular pressure is such that even Mr. Macmillan, in his speeches at least, has had to bow somewhat before it. He has to seem eager for a Summit Conference and to profess some faith in its prospects of success. He points out that Russia is trying to drive a wedge between America and Britain and Europe, and that this must not happen; but he has to add a rider that Britain formulates her own foreign policy and is not merely following America.

One of the chief arguments in favor of a Summit Conference is that, if it succeeds, it will do good, and if it fails, it can do no harm. The Labor Party's demand that no work should be done on the rocket bases until after the Conference surely provides one answer; a broader one is supplied by our eagerness to believe what we want to believe, by the irrational pressure being put on our statesmen, by the increasing wave of anti-Americanism and by the proliferation of schemes for stripping Britain of her defense.

As a history lesson, it is superb. Here before our eyes are the movements, the cross-currents, the follies and anxieties, the willful blindness, the credulous optimism, the gnawing fears and the lack of faith which bring nations down and destroy empires, delivering them into the hands of their enemies as though from a kind of dreadful death-wish.

Among ordinary people the root cause is natural enough; a longing for peace and an overwhelming weariness with rumors of war. They think no further than that. Among Socialists there is an added cause. They are not only traditionally pacifist but were brought up to believe in the brotherhood of the working classes all over the world, in the sinfulness of America as a capitalist nation and the virtues of Russia as a socialist one. The Labor Party suffered an appalling psychological shock when Ernest Bevin, that stout Foreign Secretary, spoke bluntly about the Soviet menace and brought Britain (under a Labor Government) into an Anglo-American alliance to oppose it. The trauma has never quite healed. In spite of all the evidence, a certain nostalgia for the proletarian paradise remains.

The Communists are exploiting this situation to the full. No platform is too small for Mr. Khrushchev: he even writes letters to the *New Statesman* (circulation seventy to eighty thousand). And Mao Tse-tung, who is probably a shrewder tactician, will soon be no less active in Asia.

The newspapers were too full of Summit talk to have room for more than a few inches on the SEATO conference in Manila. Perhaps this is a good thing. If they had deigned to discuss SEATO at all, most of them would have attacked American obduracy and Mr. Dulles in particular. America's attitude toward China is never explained and always condemned. This is one place where the Soviet wedges have already been firmly driven home.

The road to London and Paris, said Lenin, runs through Southeast Asia. People in Britain are much too busy gazing at the Summit to pay attention to what may be coming down the road.

From the Academy

RUSSELL KIRK

School Libraries

I don't know about you; but when I went to school, primary and secondary—in Plymouth, Michigan—we had admirable school libraries. They were open in the summer, too, and it was in that season I did my serious reading. Nowadays I wonder who selected the books in those sound libraries; probably it was some old-fangled old-maid teacher of English with no librarian's certificate. What a wealth of fantasy and history and science on those shelves! I believe, indeed, that library reading was nine-tenths of what I got from my schooling; for although Plymouth had good schools in those days, I learned much less from my classes than I learned from my mother and my grandfather.

Well, if you, too, had a good library in your school, I suggest that one of these days you peek into a school library of 1958—the one in your town. Possibly it still is a good library—just possibly. But the odds are against it.

I have on my desk, for instance, a letter from a university professor who recently did a tour of duty as a public-school visitor from the university. Here is what he found at a school in my own county—at a good-sized high school fully accredited:

"The library is a disgrace. It is true that there is a local public library and that the students are permitted the use of the library at the local college. I was not so much disturbed at what the library did not have by way of books and magazines as I was by what it did have. The classics are notable by their absence. On the other hand, there is a large selection in a separate collection of science-fiction and Westerns. The reference collection was poor and consisted largely of poorly-chosen sets. This means that the library has had money from time to time, but that the ordering has been unintelligent. Finally, the magazine rack contained not a single opinion magazine, or any other magazine that reached above the level of *Time*, the *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Popular Mechanics* and *Good Housekeeping*.

"It seems to me that the library is the heart of the education of any student. It should be attractive, neat, and possess ample seating. These conditions are not found in the library of Podunk High School."

Yet there are worse libraries than that of Podunk High School. At another Michigan county seat—let us call it Godown—the superintendent of schools bitterly resented the founding of a town public library. Apparently he feared, for one thing, that it might demand a share of the court fines which are locally allocated to school and public libraries in Michigan; until then, he had enjoyed a monopoly of the use of such funds—which, mysteriously, never were reflected in the purchase of more books for the high-school library. (Since partisans of the town public library began to inquire what the superintendent has been doing with the money, that gentleman and scholar has actually bought a few books for the Godown High School library—notably, and almost exclusively, a collection of the romances of Grace Livingston Hill. If you never had heard of the romances of Grace Livingston Hill—well, neither had I, but Miss Hill actually wrote, once upon a time.)

Moreover, declared this redoubtable superintendent, there were all the books in the high-school library that any human being needed to read—so the town public library was superfluous. And why should anyone read once he was out of school? Oh, the superintendent wasn't against brains—just against book-reading. You've guessed it: he has a master's degree in education. Once the town public library actually was established, he forbade any use of its books by school pupils, and actually forbade all teachers ever to enter its doors. Only one teacher, a Negress, has been courageous enough to disobey: she borrows books for her pupils.

There is in Michigan a "Bookmobile" program, sponsored in part by the Michigan State Library, to bring books to small communities and schools. The educational authorities in Godown town and Godown County, you may be sure, refused to have anything to do with the Bookmobile. So, for that matter, did a fair-sized city farther north. Who are these guys that want to read books, when they can be watching television round the clock, or "engaging in purposeful group activity of an enriching nature"?

Two teachers of English at different suburban high schools near Detroit recently remarked to me, on different occasions, that their students, allowed to choose their own books to report upon in class, almost to a man choose Mickey Spillane or James M. Cain. In one class of thirty, a single book report dealt with a book that by traditional standards could be considered decent, let alone important. There are a number of reasons for this. One is the triumph of "group adjustment" dullness in literature among high-school teachers and librarians, so that the nice harmless books about baseball and community life which they commend to their charges naturally are discarded in favor of something that appeals, however grossly, to the passions and the fancy. Another reason is the gradual degradation of the book clubs, book-review media, and public taste which has been going on throughout our generation. Yet another is the sad truth that, in most communities, there are no bookshops worthy of the name, and students read the trash they pick up for a quarter at the drug-store racks.

Yet when all this is said, the fact also remains that in a great many school libraries there is next to nothing for the higher imagination, the scientific curiosity, or even the harmless leisure hours: only dreary rows of watered-down children's encyclopedias, old textbooks, and "Run Spot, Run" juveniles. We spend a great deal of money on our schools, and even, nominally, on our school libraries. Why don't you have a look at the school library in your neighborhood?

Pitfalls of the Practical

STANLEY PARRY

The search for a conservative political theory continues apace. In *Radicals and Conservatives* (Regnery, $4.00), William M. McGovern and David Collier offer us "at least the beginnings of a coherent philosophy of conservative liberalism [to] strengthen the anti-collectivist movement by serving as its guide." The implication is that conservatives do not yet have a political philosophy. This is refreshing to hear. The further implication is that conservatives ought to have a political philosophy. And this is even more refreshing to hear.

When, however, the authors offer the political philosophy which they think the conservatives ought to adopt, I have my reservations. The thought of *Radicals and Conservatives* is too practical, in both the philosophical and common-sense meaning of that term. It is true that the ultimate purpose of political philosophy is to guide political action. But the distinctive features of a given political philosophy are to be found in its definition of the problem of politics; the philosophy will guide action in terms of a particular conception of the problem that is to be solved. McGovern and Collier, it seems to me, have not paid sufficient attention to the definition of the problem; and without such a definition, political action is undirected or—even worse—may derive its direction simply from the political context in which it occurs.

The practical orientation of *Radicals and Conservatives* is made explicitly clear: one of its major aims is to provide a standard to which all democratic individualists can rally, a standard that perhaps might even heal the breach between the radical and the conservative branches of the democratic tradition.

Now that we anti-collectivists—the argument runs—are beginning to make a comeback, we should focus our power by acting from a common political philosophy (Chs. 1 and 2). It seems to me that this is not a good frame of mind in which to begin a venture in political philosophy. It generates a latitudinarian attitude toward ideas, a willingness to compromise thought for the sake of unity. The utility of a political philosophy is not that it heals intellectual breaches, but that it defines the problem of political life and outlines the conditions under which it can be solved. And on this level of fundamental thought, coherent philosophy sometimes alienates as well as attracts support.

It is a cruel dilemma that a rising movement faces: to keep the ranks closed by sacrificing disturbing ideas, or to run the risk of acting without purpose because without clear ideas. Now it is sometimes argued that, among intelligent and temperate men, this dilemma can be avoided during the period of the struggle for power by discovering the areas of agreement on policy while leaving the larger question of philosophy unexamined. But certainly, once power is achieved, action requires closely defined goals and a clear perception of the problem of politics. Then the danger of philosophical division must be run; for this is a lesser danger. Sooner or later, it is necessary to clarify a position. The failure to do so creates the risk of coming into power committed to an intellectual outlook that keeps unity at the cost of purposefulness.

In achieving the practical purpose they set for themselves, McGovern and Collier do a remarkable job of formulating a coherent and integrated system of thought. They take all the traditional "Burkean" positions: distrust of abstract reasoning (Ch. 4), the preference for tradition and the sense of the group as a guide to justice (Ch. 5), an awareness of the social conditions necessary for democracy (Ch. 6) and the preference for a limited state (Ch. 7). To this they add some current positions on the forms of freedom, on subversion and on property. And they give a unity to the whole on the basis of a philosophy of empiricism. That is, they divide knowledge into two kinds; "objectively verifiable," or scientific, and intuitive, *i.e.*, based on innate feelings, that is to say, subjective or at least unanalyzable. What they have done is to present Burke on a platter of Liberal epistemology which might very well make him irresistible for those "radical liberals" who are having second thoughts about their position.

But the cost of such a feat might prove very heavy. Scientism can be used, as is evident from this book, to give philosophical underpinning to Burke. It can also be used, as is evident from Utilitarian experience, to open up a traditional society. It cannot, however, be used as the basis of a creative approach to the problems of a society in which the bonds of union are beginning to wear thin. For what such a society needs is a political policy based on a philosophical redefinition and refurbishing of the traditional values by which it has lived. The philosophy offered us in *Radicals and Conservatives* could lead to the achievement of power by conservatives, under circumstances where that power would be utilized only to implement a modified version of the policies now in force in the United States. We have before us, it may very well be, a philosophy for Modern Republicanism. Those who are not satisfied with this position must continue to look for an orienting philosophy.

Anatomy of Courage

WARREN EYSTER

"MEN HAVE always wondered about courage, what it is and where it comes from and how it works," said Major Thorn, whose act of cowardice had caused him to be appointed Awards Officer on the Punitive Expedition into Mexico. His duty is to seek out heroes, but it is his desperate personal hunger to know why men can perform acts beyond the limits of expected human conduct that constitutes the theme of Glendon Swarthout's *They Came to Cordura* (Random House, $3.50). His worship of heroism forces him to strive to preserve five men whom he considers to be the chalice in which the wine of bravery is stored. He mistakenly believes that wine can be tasted, identified and thereby understood.

Before making an appraisal of Mr. Swarthout's novel, I must preface it with this statement: I have rarely been so impressed by an author's knowledge of his basic material, in this instance, cavalry, its structure, composition, tactical problems, daily soldiering, horses and equipment. His knowledge is not librarian, but basic, objective, applied in terms of field and warfare conditions. His knowledge of horses and war reminds one of Melville's knowledge of whales and the sea.

His method of using this knowledge is, however—particularly in the first section of the novel—a return to Defoe's in *A Journal of the Plague Year*. Like Defoe, Swarthout obtains realism by exact detail, unqualified statement of fact, and strong reference to statistics. "It was a Curtiss biplane, an open-cockpit two-seater powered by a 160 h.p. steel cylinder motor and numbered 44 on its fuselage." Things happen at an exact hour, at an exact place, by an exact number of men, and for an exact purpose.

The art of fiction has, thankfully, progressed beyond the limited usage which Defoe made of it. Toward the end of the first section of the book Mr. Swarthout departs from statistical methods and sets his eye on a higher achievement—a study of the cause, content and nature of heroism. A book about war and soldiers cannot choose a better aim. Heroism remains one of the least explainable of the facets of life. Unfortunately, this new style takes unto itself not only the best but the most deadly characteristics of Hemingway prose, the staccato of drummed and headless phrases galloping through emptiness. But if Hemingway is a silversmith in his idle craft, Swarthout is a blacksmith in his busy one. The Grand Creator of Nada would have dropped his whiskey bottle at the mere suggestion of heroism on any higher plane than "He growled, I shot him, We ate him, and Fee-Fi-Fo-Fum."

IT IS therefore particularly to the credit of Mr. Swarthout that he was able—within the limits of a contrived plot, an implausible situation, a style and method that limited him largely to the external reporter—to come so close to taking his readers into an intimate experience with courage. This is felt strongest, seen clearest, and in an odd way, with considerable profundity, when Major Thorn, the real hero, near the end of his terrible ordeal, is asked, "How can you keep going?" He replies, "Don't know. First time been proud myself a long time."

Without Thorn the novel would be a farce. The five men, the *heroes*, include a bestial bawdy sergeant, a gold-brick, my-aching-back private, a West Point snob, and two youngsters, one of whom quotes Old Testament passages with annoying regularity, always appropriate to the situation, though he is not supposed to understand what he is saying. I am forced to suspect that the author breathed typhoid into him so he could become feverish and make his Biblical quotations without bothersome motivation.

The point is, these characters are a pretty sad bunch. They are a battered stench spittoon in which to put the wine of bravery. I know from experience that acts which the military refer to as heroic often are performed by brutes, idiots, gold-bricks and their ilk. Nice guys don't often make heroes. But the novel cannot help but be weakened by these characterizations, even though there is a strong defense for their existence, namely, that the author needed them to point out to his audience that true heroism is made of a far different substance and stands on a far higher spiritual plane than merely jumping over a wall under enemy fire or bashing a few Mexican heads together.

At last, almost by a process of elimination, the mantle of heroism is brought to rest upon the only one left, the only man in the bunch who can stand up under its strain and its responsibility, almost as if it were being bequeathed to him through his appreciation for and devotion to five soldiers who had performed five momentary heroic acts. Major Thorn becomes the hero, his voice crying out to the men, "For a few minutes you proved that there is something above and beyond the law of nature . . ."

THE underlying irony of the novel is not that courage is undiscoverable or untranslatable into language, but that Thorn, whose worship of heroism forces him into a prolonged, continuous act of courage in order to preserve "the golden men"—Thorn cannot understand courage because he cannot recognize himself. He blindly seeks in the faces of other men what already rests in his own heart. And when his valor begins to sing out from him, he surpasses the capabilities of his own flesh in a beatific final effort to save the men. A railroad handcar becomes his cross.

This is a novel the slick critics can really nail, for its plot and technical defects are numerous. Equally unfortunate, it is open to considerable

To order any book reviewed in this section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER
Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N.Y.

Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed
Please send me: .....
(name of book)
.....
.....
Name .....
Address .....
.....
(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

symbolic interpretation, obvious Biblical ones, the juxtaposition of New Testament love-heroism with Old Testament eye-for-an-eye heroes. That sort of stuff is a modern critic's paradise, offering easy explanations and analogies—like a parlor gathering of neurotic ladies whose bonnets are brimming with Freudian symbols.

In the end this book will not go down as great. It has too many props and signposts, too much façade and contrivance. It pays too heavy a price for its achievement and it offers too little of the human spirit which has not already been given to us. In making this criticism, I do not wish to damage the fact that it stands head and shoulders above trash like *The Caine Mutiny* and half-trash like *From Here to Eternity*. If Mr. Swarthout will set aside his own skepticism about human nobility and courage, if he will let his characters stand upon their own feet, he will be one of America's finest novelists.

Theater

Why Olivier?

EDWARD CASE

JOHN OSBORNE has been described as the most important young dramatist to waylay the British stage in the last life cycle of the locust. Sir Laurence Olivier is esteemed as one of the great, perhaps THE greatest, English-speaking actors of our times. The appearance of Olivier in a play by Osborne, *The Entertainer,* cannot fail to be a major event of the current season.

The Entertainer is about Archie Rice, a middle-aged, mediocre song-and-dance man, dirty-joking his way to final failure. Involved with him are sturdy, self-respecting Billy Rice, his father, one of the music-hall greats of a better age; Phoebe Rice, Archie's ineffectual and maudlin second wife; Jean Rice, his intelligent and rebellious daughter by his first marriage; and Frank Rice, Archie and Phoebe's son. There is another son, Mick, who is off with the British Army in the Suez fiasco, and who is important in the plot though he does not appear. The scene is a dingy lodging house in an English coastal resort.

Let me say at once that there are two good things in all this, and these are the performances of George Ralph, as Billy Rice, and Brenda de Banzie as Phoebe. Ralph acts with rare dignity and restraint in a part written to bring out the ham in a lesser player. This is truly a distinguished performance, and scarcely less distinguished is the performance of Miss de Banzie, who gives believable warmth and humanity to a part which might only too readily lend itself to pathetic excess. One might add that Joan Plowright and Richard Pasco, as Jean and Frank Rice, do as much as can be done in roles difficult to do much with.

AS TO the rest, the play and the star, I have my reservations.

The principal thing to note about John Osborne is not his talent but his cleverness. One may achieve success as a playwright by giving the public what it likes, or by making it like what it gets. This is to say that one may write conventionally and agreeably, or one may write unconventionally, but to such effect that the public's canons of acceptance are altered and enlarged. Osborne has found a third and middle way. By seasoning the packaged ingredients for modern dramatic success with abundant if obvious sauce and giving a new garnish to the same consumer-researched cuisine, he satisfies two kinds of appetite.

He gives the general New York and London public what it really craves—sex, tension-relieving profanity and standard homosexual jests, a peep at a big-bosomed nude, screaming emotion whose intensity makes up for its falseness, melodramatic pathos to which the least sensitive can recognize how to respond, cheap political gibes which awaken the guffaws of the slogan-minded, fashionable despair, the unexpected twist in the plot just before boredom—and pace, loads of pace. On the other hand, Osborne is conscious, very conscious, that success is in the Aye of the fourth-row beholder. So he gives the critics and the intellectuals a full ration of social significance and commentary, and the kind of unmistakable symbolism which flatters the second-rate mind with the illusion of discovery and which even Brooks Atkinson can figure out before his deadline. Thus, the public can enjoy what it does enjoy, and feel virtuous by critical dispensation, and the high-minded can yield to lower zones of enjoyment without fear of hypocrisy.

THE COMMONLY expressed view of Osborne as a dramatist is that both his merits and his defects are the product of innocence. Whatever faults he may have are debited to excessive passion, the over-zealous honesty and purity of youthful feeling insufficiently chastened by the restraints of craftsmanship and experience. Quite the reverse is true. He is a master of stagecraft. Any student of the drama may well scrutinize with profit and admiration the economy of means by which Osborne keeps his stage alive. In *Look Back in Anger,* for example, he gets by with five characters and one extremely cheap set. And in *The Entertainer* the same craft is discernible. Seven characters (eight, if you count Britannia, the briefly glimpsed nude who is the most honestly created figure in the play) and a simple set quickly transformed by sketchy flats and gauzy curtains. And Osborne manipulates these thrifty arrangements with easy skill and fits his play, with its clever alternation of music-hall turns and dramatic scenes, to them in a disciplined and effective pattern.

This is a real pro. The trouble is that with all his enormous technical competence Osborne as yet has really nothing much to say. It is not lack of dramatic know-how which accounts for the excessive and seemingly undirected chatter, the gorging overabundance which even his admirers notice. He is not awkward in expressing his point. It is just that his points are elementary and few, as his insights are scant and ordinary. He conceals this, as many another man does, with a great deal of talk.

The weakness of Osborne's charac-

terizations in *The Entertainer* would stand out more nakedly were it not for the fact that Olivier is the star. When Olivier is on the stage it is impossible to forget the presence of a great actor. This is, perhaps, his ultimate undoing.

We see Olivier hoofing, Olivier mugging, Olivier singing, Olivier pattering, Olivier jesting, Olivier sobbing, Olivier drunk, Olivier sober, Olivier breaking down, Olivier blowing up—yet Archie Rice does not seem real in the sense that a Ralph Richardson or an Alec Guinness might have made him so. What one must conclude, I think, is that Olivier has no compassion for Archie Rice, although there are some grounds in the text for a deeper portrait, and that therefore he plays the part as an exhibition rather than in earnest.

But what is more interesting and revealing than anything Olivier did on the stage was the fact that he chose the part to begin with. Olivier, it must be remembered, may have first choice of any script. He would be a sell-out even if he essayed a rendition in knee-breeches of *The Collected Introductions of Ed Sullivan.* Why, then, should this man, knighted for his services to the British theater, distinguished for his portrayals of kings and heroes, noted for his splendid articulation of the glories of English verse, elect to appear in a play which is nothing more than a proclamation of the ignoble death of Britain and a sustained and despairing sneer at everything traditional and noble in the British heritage? Either Sir Laurence understands Mr. Osborne or he does not. From either of these alternative possibilities dramatic conclusions may be drawn, tragic or comic as the case may be. There is a play within a play here.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

MOON SQUADRON, by Jerrard Tickell (Doubleday, $3.50). In 1940, when the British were shaking off the effects of the disaster in France, a secret military organization was set up with Winston Churchill's blessing. This was the Special Operations Executive, and its mission was informal warfare, any kind that could be mounted in enemy-occupied country, including sabotage, spying, deception and the raising and supply of guerrilla bands. Most of the SOE people who worked on these matters in France were delivered by air, either by parachute or in equally hazardous landings on secret strips. This book describes some SOE adventures from the standpoint of Royal Air Force Squadron 138, which carried in the agents, picked them up and brought them back on occasion, and looked after their supply dropping, itself an exceedingly difficult and dangerous task. The Squadron's Polish crews even made a gallant attempt to help the patriots of Warsaw betrayed by the Communist forces outside the town. Whatever the final military evaluation of "special ops" may be, Mr. Tickell underlines one moral certainty when he says that these fliers and agents showed the world "they believed in victory."

F. FARR

LYTTON STRACHEY: HIS MIND AND ART, by Charles Richard Sanders (Yale, $6.00). As the liberator of biography in English, Lytton Strachey had two basic tenets: 1) brevity, selection, concision; 2) and even more important, a point of view. A good biographer has to go out on limbs. "The worst and the best parts of us," he wrote, "are the secrets we never reveal"; and in his own biographies it was these secrets he ventured to probe and piece together. Ironically, his own life, which was certainly not without secrets, has drawn a biographer who knows his Strachey Theory, apparently approves of it, even spends unconcise chapter after chapter reiterating it; but then goes on to betray his master entirely by writing the sort of safe, professorial study which reveals little or nothing of the man himself. This is an unqualified pity, and I'm afraid only Mr. Sanders' timidity can be blamed. For his research is thorough; he has been given some wonderful photographs to reproduce; and his publishers have made him a handsome book. If he had only cast his bread on the waters, we might have had a biography worth owning.

R. PHELPS

THE NOTEBOOKS OF SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE, Vol. I, 1794-1804, Text and Notes, edited by Kathleen Coburn (Pantheon, $12.50 the set, boxed). In the development of Anglo-American conservative thought, Samuel Taylor Coleridge's influence has been of the highest importance. But that influence does not arise from any single work; nor indeed does it spring primarily from any group of his formal public writings. It is the pervasive influence of a man of powerful personality and incisive critical mind, who was in the first instance a poet and a critic of literature. His effects upon social and political theory have been indirect and slowly cumulative. The full publication of his *Notebooks,* if this first of five volumes is characteristic, will enlarge and deepen Coleridge's reputation and influence. Rich, complex, full of brilliant insights on every subject under the sun, they add immensely to a stature already great. Pantheon Books, and the Bollingen Foundation which has made publication possible, are to be congratulated on a magnificent contribution to letters and to political thought.

F. S. MEYER

FINAL REPORT, by Col. Jozef Beck (Speller, $6.00). It is refreshing to read the memoirs of a man who frankly struggled for the best interests of his country. Beck, Poland's Foreign Minister in the thirties, was not always right, but he was a realist who did his best. It was impossible, no doubt, to have preserved the short-lived independence of Poland in the Balkanized East Europe of Versailles. Yalta, to be sure, "solved" all such questions. Yet many of the forces and problems with which Beck struggled still exist—and in happier days, let us pray, will have to be solved. Thus Beck's sad tale has current relevance, especially his penetrating analysis of the impotent League of Nations.

J. P. MCFADDEN

To the Editor

Radio Free Europe

As a member of a national women's organization which has lent the prestige of its name to the Crusade for Freedom, may I congratulate you upon the objectiveness of your editorial "Mr. Lewis and Radio Free Europe" [March 29]. I have protested against circularizing petitions for the organization which purports to send "truth dollars" to free the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain. My tilt with Radio Free Europe is not that it is mismanaged, inefficient and pro-National Communism. The philosophy behind the whole operation is a delusion. What right have we Americans to extol the advantages of democracy and freedom to those whose necks bear the yoke of the slave, while at the same time our government subsidizes the same cruel tyrants in power, as in Poland and Yugoslavia? What Hungarian would believe a word of what comes over Radio Free Europe after we urged them to aspire to freedom and then, like Pilate, "washed our hands" of them when they attempted revolt?

The only way we can prove our sincerity and deep concern for the 850 million captives behind the Iron Curtain is . . . by withdrawing diplomatic recognition of Soviet Russia. No other single move would so electrify the captive nations to the possibility of freedom as our denunciation of their rulers. . . . Until we change our foreign policy, the Crusade for Freedom and Radio Free Europe might as well be written off. Does it not seem ironic to be supporting a $30 million project beamed behind an Iron Curtain which spares no expense to jam the reception, and then roll out the carpet for the Drum & Bugle Corps of the Red Army in the interests of "exchanging culture"? As Alice put it, things "get curioser and curioser."

Pittsburgh, Pa. MARY A. SHERMAN

I fully endorse your editorial "Mr. Lewis and Radio Free Europe." However, I still think with Mr. Lewis that a full-fledged congressional investigation is by far superior to any privately organized investigation. Only a congressional committee would have enough money to spend and the power to subpoena. You cannot get the whole story without the sworn testimony of dozens of witnesses, among them top officials, present and former employees who have nothing to fear and no RFE job to lose. . . .

Since I have been interested in RFE for many years and since I have just visited its installations in Munich, I'm well aware of the almost unsurmountable difficulties any private investigation must encounter. Only Congress has the power to force witnesses to appear under oath and to be heard in *public as well as in executive* sessions which latter proved so important in the congressional investigation of the Katyn massacre.

New York City JULIUS EPSTEIN

Your lengthy editorial on Lewis *vs.* RFE was interesting reading. I shall only comment on your recommendations for a survey committee. I have followed the activities of RFE since its inception—at which time I recognized that a large number of its officials and sponsors were also identified with socialistic inclinations. This created a stimulus to the analysis of a problem—how could Socialists sell the American Way of Life to foreign nations? My conclusions to date jibe with those of many other individuals, including Lewis. They have not portrayed or tried to sell their audience on the principles of freedom that created this nation. They have advertised this nation as a socialist state.

It does not require a commission to confirm this fact. You can't get a zebra by mating a lion with a tiger. You can't get Americanism from the lips of Socialists.

Washington, Ind. A. G. BLAZEY, M.D.

Pitfalls of History

With reference to Mr. Hugh Kenner's article, "What More Do You Want?" in your March 1 issue, it is rare to find a bit of debunking that is really useful and constructive, and this is what Mr. Kenner's excellent article seems to be. I refer especially to the passage about Mr. Sandburg, American history and the cult of the Civil War. His article would, however, be of even more value if he went on from debunking to some sort of *positive* statement about history and historians.

There are, it seems, two kinds of historians. First, those who believe, in the words of Mr. Kenner, "in the past as a reservoir of purely emotional nourishment"—in other words, they use history to conceal history. Secondly, the true historian who does not allow the facts to become submerged in anecdotage. Thus Alexander Del Mar is a greater historian than de Toqueville; or, to take a modern example, Toynbee is not as great an historian as either Catherine Drinker Bowen or General J. F. C. Fuller. It is to be deplored how long it takes real historians like the above to get into University curricula. Finally, it is well to remember, that, in history, retrospect is often a way in which to conceal proportion.

London, England WILLIAM COOKSON

The Quality of Judges

Re the "brilliant analysis" of [the Jenner Bill] by Mr. Bozell [March 1], can he seriously ask the question, "where is the national loss?" when various state courts interpret the same document (*i.e.*, the Federal Constitution) to suit their own tastes? The Fourteenth Amendment provides that no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law. To determine whether a state has so deprived, it is only fundamental that a higher authority than the state itself pass on the question. Mr. Bozell would have each State Supreme Court rule on whether that state of which it is an integral part has or has not deprived a person of due process of law. This is analogous to allowing an accused to declare himself guilty or innocent of the crime charged in the indictment.

I submit that a statute which allowed a state to interpret the applicability of the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause to itself would not only be ridiculous, it would be unconstitutional. After all the document

should be read in its entirety and it is still, "the supreme Law of the Land." Should a "supreme Law" have 48 interpretations?

Baltimore, Md. DONALD J. GRALEN

The Fifth Amendment provides that the national government shall not deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law. Is it Mr. Gralen's point that the national Supreme Court is not fit to judge whether the national government has violated the Fifth Amendment?

Article III, Section 2 provides, without qualification, that the Supreme Court's appellate jurisidiction is subject to "such exceptions . . . as the Congress shall make." Mr. Gralen is at liberty, of course, to regard the provision as "ridiculous."

Chevy Chase, Md. L. BRENT BOZELL

No Friend of Byron

Dr. Medford Evans [March 15] is, I think, mistaken when he attributes that famous repartee "If you will believe that, you will believe anything" to a friend of Lord Byron. It has, in fact, been attributed to many notables, from Dr. Johnson onwards, but its originator was, I believe on the best of authority, the Duke of Wellington. He was certainly no friend of Byron!

London, England ALISTAIR HORNE

A Thorn in the Liberal Side

Please express to Mr. Clifford Irion my congratulations on his article on "The Byrd Machine" [March 29]. I have a son running a farm in Byrdinia and I am familiar with conditions in that good principality. Mr. Irion certainly understands the situation.

I get considerable pleasure out of the cold, white hatred the Liberals feel toward Harry Byrd and how very little they can do about it.

Columbus, S.C. R. BEVERLEY HERBERT

Remedies for Economic Anaemia

In its editorial column of March 9, the *New York Daily News* called attention to the fact that our people now have $31.9 billion in our 520 mutual savings banks and are even now adding to that handsome kitty at a surprising rate. The total grew by $63 million in January and by $283 million in February. The *News* interprets these figures to mean that the "recession" is in no small part traceable to a "buyers' strike." People are not spending for anything they do not urgently need.

If these are signs of a trend toward thrift, it is scarcely one to deplore. If they are astute hoardings against the evil day, then sluicing vast sums of inflationary money into the economy from Washington is not going to reassure the canny. But if it is in large part a "buyers' strike," the remedy is not high-pressure salesmanship, as the *News* suggested, but a cut in prices; and not a sneaky one, to beat the competitors to it, but a loudly proclaimed one. To dramatize such an experiment, no measure could be more effective than a voluntary cut by the management of all corporations in their absurdly high executive and board salaries by 50 per cent. Nothing justifies executive salaries of three, six or even eight times that of the President of the United States, plus big pensions . . .

While the public was still blinking and gasping at that one, the corporations should broadcast a determination to resist to the bitter end any labor monopoly's demand for wage increases not justified by labor's increased productivity, and promise that they would pull the fires, wall up the gate and board up the windows rather than connive with labor again to raise prices to the consumer.

With that declaration should come an announcement of a substantial reduction of prices—coupled with a demand on government for a reduction of both excise and income taxes.

Such measures, as I have said, could be dramatized. I believe that if one big corporation took such steps, using all of its advertising space and radio time to capture the public's imagination, another would quickly follow suit, then another; and then whole bevies of them would scramble into the movement. . . . Sales would grow until small profits on a multitude of them would add up to substantial earnings. The worried little investor in common stocks, as well as the big institutional investor, would be reassured and would refrain from rocking the boat by dumping their certificates on their brokers.

If that isn't a likelier way of restoring both health to the economy and confidence to the public than Washington's deficit financing of a new WPA (which institution made no visible impression on the great slump of the thirties), this writer would like to know why.

Bernardsville, N. J. HEPTISAX

CLASSIFIED

NATIONAL REVIEW *accepts classified advertisements for personal services, items wanted or for sale, jobs sought or available, houses or apartments for sale or rent, and miscellaneous subjects of a comparable nature.* NATIONAL REVIEW *reserves the right to reject any copy deemed unsuitable. Rates per insertion: 40¢ per word, minimum 10 words; 30¢ per word for 25 or more insertions per year. If a box number is desired, count two extra words. Text, accompanied by full payment in the form of cash, check or money order, must be received 17 days before publication date. All responses to box numbers will be forwarded and postage billed periodically. Mail to be called for at* NATIONAL REVIEW *will be held 60 days only. Address: Classified Dept.,* NATIONAL REVIEW, *211 East 37th Street, New York 16, N.Y.*

MAKE VACATION PLANS NOW! Worldwide service to suit individual requirements. Margaret Cone Travel Service, 520 5th Ave., N.Y. 36, OX 7-0796.

ILLUSTRATED bibliography-catalogue of golf books, prints, curios. Send $1. Golf Book Service, 42-05 Layton St., Elmhurst, New York.

SPEAKERS FOR the May 26 Crusade for America forum will be Wm. F. Buckley Jr., and L. Brent Bozell. To receive full information, write Crusade for America, 51 Front St., Rockville Center, L.I., N.Y.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS by mail $2. Available for parties and lectures. Dorothy Sara, 11 E. 32 St., NYC.

SEND YOUR OPINIONS to every Congressman every month, 33¢ per month. Free Trial. Poll-NaRe, 430 S. Michigan, Chicago 5, Ill.

FREEDOM THROUGH UNDERSTANDING fourteen great life-problems. *Balanced Living:* sample, 25¢. School of Living, Brookville, Ohio.

"NO WONDER WE ARE LOSING," by Robert Morris, former Counsel, U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee: 230 pages, $2.50, postage prepaid. The Bookmailer, Box 101, New York 16, N.Y.

FREEDOM SCHOOL now accepting applications for enrollment in 1958 summer courses. Instructors include: Frank Chodorov, James Doenges, E. W. Dykes, Percy Greaves Jr., F. A. Harper, R. C. Hoiles, Louis Milione Jr., Robert LeFevre, Leonard Read, James Rogers, Fred Clark, Rose Wilder Lane, William Paton. Write Box 165, Colorado Springs, Colo., for free descriptive folder.

WHY NOT GIVE National Review to your local library, school, Rotary, Kiwanis? Only $8.00 for first subscription, $7.00 for each additional subscription. Address Subscription Dept., National Review, 211 East 37th St., New York 16, N.Y.

THE END OF McCARTHY. Reprints of National Review feature articles on the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, available 25c each, 100 for $15. Dept. R, National Review, 211 East 37 St., N.Y. 16, N.Y.